

I. Rejections Under §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As amended, claim 1 no longer recites the term "about" upon which the rejection is based. Thus, in view of the Amendment, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to the recitation of "about" in claims 15 and 16, Applicants respectfully submit that this term does not render the claims indefinite. One skilled in the art would understand that the grid has a strength that is about equal to the tensile strength in the lengthwise direction of the strips. The term "about" does not render the claim indefinite because the tensile strength of the strips in the lengthwise direction can be determined by one skilled in the art. Thus, the expected strength of the grid can be readily determined by one skilled in the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under §103

**A. Yang (US 5,458,711) in view of Kobiella (US 4,483,438)
and Romanek (US 4,265,954)**

Claims 1-7 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yang in view of Romanek and Kobiella. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As amended, claim 1 indicates that "the strips comprise a material that absorbs electromagnetic radiation at the at least one zone of overlap." Applicants respectfully submits that Yang does not teach or suggest this feature of the invention. Furthermore, the teachings of Romanek and Kobiella fail to cure this defect in the teachings of Yang.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-7 and 15-18 would not have been obvious over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**B. Yang in View of Kobiella and Romanek and Further in
View of Foglia et al. (US 3,560,291)**

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Yang in view of Kobiella and Romanek and further in view of Foglia. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends directly from claim 1 and thus incorporates all of the limitations of the independent claim. Thus, in view of the amendment of claim 1, claim 6 is likewise distinguished from the prior art. None of the references Yang, Kobiella or Romanek teach or suggest the use of a material that absorbs electromagnetic radiation at the at least one zone of overlap. The citation of Foglia in the rejection of claim 6 does not cure the deficiencies identified and discussed with respect to Yang, Kobiella and Romanek. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been able to derive the invention of claim 6 based on the teachings the cited references.

For at least these reasons, claim 6 would not have been obvious over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application is earnestly requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Stephen Tu
Registration No. 52,304

WPB/SXT:amw

Attachment:
Appendix

Date: October 28, 2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>

APPENDIX

Changes to Claims:

Claims 19-23 are added.

The following is a marked-up version of the amended claim(s):

1. (Amended) A grid comprising drawn polymeric strips in at least two different directions, wherein the strips have a higher tensile strength in a lengthwise direction of the strips compared to a tensile strength in a width direction of the strips, wherein the strips are bonded together in at least one zone of overlap, which ~~wherein said at least one zone of overlap comprises at least two spatially separated bonding points or bonding lines, and wherein the strips comprise a material that absorbs electromagnetic radiation at the at least one zone of overlap at least some of the bonding lines are in angle of about 70°-110° to the lengthwise direction of at least some of the strips of the grid.~~